

ANNALES
UNIVERSITATIS MARIAE CURIE-SKŁODOWSKA
LUBLIN – POLONIA

VOL. LXXIX

SECTIO B

2024

ANDREA GIAMPICCOLI

<https://orcid.org/0000-0002-2963-2031>

Durban University of Technology

Department of Hospitality and Tourism

Ritson Campus, PO Box 1334, Durban, 4000, South Africa

andrea.giampiccoli@gmail.com

OLIVER MTAPURI

<https://orcid.org/0000-0001-7698-9482>

University of KwaZulu-Natal

School of Built Environment and Development Studies

Howard College, Mazisi Kunene Avenue

Durban 4001, South Africa

mtapurio@ukzn.ac.za

JITHENDRA MAHARAJ

<https://orcid.org/0000-0003-1139-3420>

JR Maharaj Consulting, Freelance academic

aquablaze2@yahoo.com

SEAN JUGMOHAN

<http://orcid.org/0000-0003-0640-2433>

Durban University of Technology, M.L. Sultan Campus

Business School, Faculty of Management Sciences

PO Box 1334, Durban, 4000, South Africa

seanj@dut.ac.za

Promoting Community-Based Tourism:
Strategies for Encouraging Adoption
of Community-Centered Practices in the Tourism Industry

Promowanie turystyki opartej na społeczności. Strategie zachęcające branżę
turystyczną do wdrażania praktyk zorientowanych na społeczność

Abstract: The existence of poverty and unemployment requires that private businesses and other stakeholders work with the government to address them given the potential found in tourism. The purpose of the article is to present the role and meaning of community-based tourism (CBT) in addressing poverty and unemployment in the broad tourism industry. This article follows desktop research and primarily focuses on pathways to incentivize the transformation of the conventional/mass tourism sector so that is central in the fight against poverty and unemployment which are prevalent in society. The authors propose a framework that aims to transform the industry through the adoption of incentives to embrace the finer qualities found in CBT. The paper concludes with discussions centred on incentives for either profit and/or capital sharing based on socioeconomic principles grounded in current ownership of capital by industry staff and members of surrounding communities and local governments, espoused in the principles of CBT.

Keywords: incentives; inequality; profits; transformation; tax

Abstrakt: Istnienie ubóstwa i bezrobocia wymaga, aby prywatne przedsiębiorstwa oraz inne zainteresowane strony współpracowały z rządem w celu rozwiązania tych problemów, biorąc pod uwagę potencjał tkwiący w turystyce. Celem artykułu jest przedstawienie roli turystyki opartej na społeczności (*community-based tourism*, CBT) oraz jej znaczenia w rozwiązywaniu problemu ubóstwa i bezrobocia w szeroko rozumianej branży turystycznej. Artykuł powstał w oparciu o źródła wtórne. Skoncentrowano się w nim przede wszystkim na ścieżkach zachęcających do transformacji sektora turystyki konwencjonalnej/masowej tak, aby stał się kluczowy w walce z ubóstwem i bezrobociem panującymi w społeczeństwie. Autorzy proponują ramy, których celem jest transformacja branży poprzez przyjęcie najlepszych rozwiązań funkcjonujących w ramach CBT. Opracowanie kończy się dyskusją skupioną na propozycjach podziału zysków i/lub kapitału prowadzonych w oparciu o zasady społeczno-ekonomiczne, bazujące na posiadaniu kapitału przez pracowników branży oraz członków lokalnych społeczności i samorządów, rekomendowane w zasadach CBT.

Słowa kluczowe: zachęty; nierówność; zyski; transformacja; podatek

INTRODUCTION

Tourism is a major industry globally. In 2019, the President & CEO of the World Travel & Tourism Council (WTTC) wrote one more time, “the strong economic performance of Travel & Tourism proves the power of the sector as a tool for governments to generate prosperity while creating jobs around the world” (Guevara Manzo, 2019, no page). The statistics of the WTTC (2019, p. 3) indicate that “[t]he direct contribution of Travel & Tourism to GDP in 2018 was USD 2,750.7 bn (3.2% of GDP). This is forecast to rise by 3.6% to USD 2,849.2 bn in 2019” and the tourism sector is vital for many countries around the world. Tourism, while not necessarily the largest industry in the world, its importance cannot be ignored (Lew, 2011, p. 148). Despite the well-recognized global value of the tourism sector, the debate about its effectiveness towards poverty alleviation is still current (Holden et al., 2011, p. 317). As such, it is currently accepted that while the tourism sector

brings positive effects, it also brings various negative effects, for example, on local communities and in developing countries (Archer et al., 2005; Nagarjuna, 2015; Triarchi & Karamanis, 2017). For instance, its negative impacts could include increasing cost of living, the creation of menial, low skilled and low-paying jobs, uneven distribution of tourism profits, crime, very little empowerment of local people, cultural and natural resource degradation, and crowded living areas (Lee & Jan, 2019, p. 368). In particular, it is noted that the conventional/mass tourism approach is not working to redistribute resources (Saayman & Giampiccoli, 2016, p. 148). The tourism sector is involved in intensifying class and regional inequalities and has various glaring economic, social and environmental impacts (Tosun et al., 2003, p. 133).

The existence of poverty, inequality and unemployment requires that private businesses and other stakeholders work with the Government to address them given the potential found in tourism. Inequality in societies is growing (Alvaredo et al., 2018, p. 68; Derviş & Qureshi, 2016, p. 2; UN, 2019, p. 87). It, therefore, appears “obvious” that the tourism sector, as a major global and leading sector in various countries, could increase its role in decreasing inequality and poverty around the world. The issue is to find new solutions that enhance the role of tourism towards counteracting and decreasing inequality, given that the current traditional conventional/mass tourism approach seems not to be achieving the required results. This article aims to propose a possible new tourism approach aimed at transforming the conventional/mass tourism sector, towards an alternative tourism approach steeped in community-based tourism (CBT) principles and characteristics. The article specifically focuses on the CBT principles and characteristics associated with ownership and distributive measures. This article aims to contribute to the ongoing debate on the relationship between tourism development and the role of CBT in addressing poverty and unemployment in the broader tourism industry leveraging incentives.

METHODOLOGY

In terms of methodology, it is desktop research based on academic and non-academic literature and organizational documents available in the public domain. No primary data were collected during its compilation. The authors looked at academic and journal articles focusing on CBT, and incentives. Through inductive reasoning, concepts and ideas were crystalized to converge on a model/framework which is postulated in this paper of incentives to buoy tourism ventures infused with CBT qualities for the benefit of the disadvantaged members of society. According

to Sauce and Matzel (n.d., p. 1), “[i]nductive reasoning encompasses most cases of where a general principle is derived or where categories are formed based on specific observations and is the logical foundation of science”.

LITERATURE REVIEW

The topic of inequality is highly debated (Derviş & Qureshi, 2016, p. 2) and inequality (there are many types of inequalities as it can exist in many spheres such as health, income, education and wealth, see Rohwerder, 2016, p. 4) has global occurrence and therefore, relevance. It is increasing in many developed and developing countries. During the last three decades, income inequality has grown and has reached levels not seen since before the last world war (Derviş & Qureshi, 2016, p. 2; see also Alvaredo et al., 2018, p. 68). A 2019 United Nations document (UN, 2019, p. 87) writes that socio-economic inequalities have been widening since the 1980s and this has been encumbering progress and the enjoyment of shared prosperity among peoples. Problems related to inequality are relevant “because the relative position of individuals or households in society is considered an important aspect of their welfare” (Rohwerder, 2016, p. 40).

Poverty alleviation is closely linked to issues of inequality and inequality makes it difficult to fight poverty (Yang, 2018, p. 21). There is a link between inequality and poverty such that “a decrease in income inequality is an important poverty-reduction tool, whereas economic growth may not be so crucial [...] reductions in inequality can play a critical role in ensuring that growth will lead to a decline in poverty levels” (Tabosa et al., 2016, p. 154). For example: it is noted that within countries, a reduction in inequality has the potential to reduce global poverty (Alvaredo et al., 2018, p. 11). To speedily decrease absolute poverty, it behoves countries to adopt policies that promote growth and undertake income distribution (Khemili & Belloumi, 2018, p. 10).

Thus, inequality is a challenge and encroaches on the eradication of poverty (Rohwerder, 2016, p. 40). Moreover, as noted by the UN (2013, p. 22), “[i]nequality is also an issue of social justice”. Inequalities are related to many issues such as weakening social cohesion and the manifestation of it as a social injustice and a latent infringement of human rights. The interconnectedness of inequalities means some people constantly experience inferior prospects than others (Rohwerder, 2016, p. 41). Fundamentally, also with good growth prospects, in emerging economies following a “business as usual” strategy, income inequality will continue to rise (Alvaredo et al., 2018, p. 18). This has been described, contextually, in the expressions of a 2019 United Nations document (UN, 2019, p. XXI) as: “The benefits

from trade and financial liberalization are now increasingly viewed as exacerbating income and wealth inequality within countries, limiting policy space and even, in some cases, undermining national sovereignty.” Economic growth might be not enough to reduce poverty and inequality (Kinyondo & Pelizzo, 2018, p. 17). The claim that markets function to allocate resources based on price signals is an ideological approach which hides the fact that production and distribution are a result of a dialectics of inequalities of power and class struggles and therefore markets are political despite the “value-neutral” position given to neoclassical theory (Bianchi, 2018, p. 89). To reduce poverty and inequality, there is a need to make economic growth more inclusive and sustainable (Niemhom, 2018, p. 9). This implies that multipronged approaches and interventions are needed to deal with both poverty and inequality given their intractability and interconnectedness.

The tourism sector remains and works within neoliberalism (Chok et al., 2007; Saayman & Giampiccoli, 2016, p. 147). In this context, it is hypothesized on two premises that tourism can reduce poverty given its potential to contribute to economic growth and that economic growth, in turn, has the potential to effectively reduce poverty (Gartner & Cukier, 2012). Instead, it has been observed that under specific conditions, tourism can exacerbate poverty (Gartner & Cukier, 2012, p. 561). Thus, if specific actions are not taken, for example in education, tourism development can have negative effects on the poor (Saayman et al., 2012) and it can encourage the advancement of a “culture of servitude” (Faulkenberry et al., 2000). The web of international tourism includes large transnational corporations that dominate in the hospitality, transportation and entertainment industries with airlines, resorts and tour operators that promote “mass tourism” through packaged tours and have profited enormously through neoliberal transnational policies and regulations at the expense of the destination countries who depend on the “west” for these visitors, financing and expertise (Jamal et al., 2019, p. 128).

This implies that neoliberalism is entrenching exploitation and servitude in destination countries in pursuit of mass tourism. Examples of negative relationships between tourism development and reduction in inequality and poverty are widespread. Evidence from China indicates, that ecotourism has entrenched income inequality in natural reserves (Ma et al., 2019, p. 242). A Peruvian study shows that tourism has reduced poverty in some instances, however, the poorest are not faring any better requiring specific policies that ensure that the full benefits of tourism are enjoyed by all in support of both spatial and social welfare (Llorca-Rodríguez et al., 2016, p. 753). A study from Tanzania shows that while the growth of tourism has stimulated employment and economic development, inequality has not been reduced materially (Kinyondo & Pelizzo, 2015, p. 76). It identifies three factors that undermined efforts to reduce poverty and inequality, foreign ownership, verti-

cal integration and sub-standard salary packages for the local tourism workforce (Kinyondo & Pelizzo, 2015, p. 76). A study based on a conventional all-inclusive sun-and-sea model suggests that income derived from tourism has exacerbated income inequality in the Dominican Republic and “the number of poor people not only increased, but those who remain poor become poorer as a consequence of tourist activity” (Oviedo-García et al., 2019, p. 1008). Thus, this study shows that it is a prerogative of the government to enact policies that improve the standards of living of its people through redistribution (Oviedo-García et al., 2019, p. 1008). Community-based tourism is being submitted, as well as in this article, as a possible solution, even if it is not easy to achieve. The Peruvian National Strategic Plans for Tourism support CBT for rural development anchored on the conservation of the environment, intensive female employment and the formation of small businesses. However, this should be accompanied by involving local communities in planning, improving their skills, providing access to information and communication technologies as well as improving their infrastructure such as accommodation, water, electricity and sewerage systems (Llorca-Rodríguez et al., 2016, p. 753).

In general, a new direction towards alternative forms of tourism and tourism management that enhance the role of local communities and decrease the negative effects thereof are, therefore, being proposed in this paper. For instance, the responsible tourism initiatives of Kerala, India, consider it as a deliberate tourism management strategy to involve various aspects of planning, business management, marketing, product development, and management for positive socio-economic and cultural impacts (Kerala Tourism, 2012 in Mathew & Sreejesh, 2017, p. 84). Other models have been developed for sustainable destination management to improve the standard of people in destination communities (Mathew & Sreejesh, 2017, p. 86). There is a need to standardize tourism business practices by enhancing their social responsibility ethos and raising their environmental awareness to protect the environment (Wenjing, 2018, p. 243). For example, it is suggested that a collective approach is necessary that involves communities, agencies, and enterprises if sustainable destinations are to be delivered (Burren & Cliffs of Moher Geopark, 2017, p. 12).

New management approaches can be envisaged, for example, in ecotourism enterprises where a management model should have aspects such as business licences, a certification system, and a controlling association in which innovation and ecological consciousness are vital (Wenjing, 2018, p. 243). Innovation is fundamental as it drives competitiveness in all industries including tourism (Pikemaat, 2008, p. 1). A fundamental component of tourism is to embrace change on many fronts to achieve high impact (Dwyer et al., 2009). A triple-bottom-line approach linked to sustainability can also be considered requiring that corporate performance should benefit both shareholders and stakeholders – who include lo-

cal communities in which businesses operate (Stoddard et al., 2012, p. 235). The tenets of Corporate Governance speak to achieving harmonious development of financial, social and environmental objectives yet, as evidenced by Giampicoli and Saayman (2017, p. 10), Telfer and Sharpley (2008, p. 345) and the UN (2019, p. 87), environmental and poverty alleviation issues continue to be marginalized due to the Tourism Industry's goal of profit maximisation. The doctrine of profit maximization could be at the root of the prevalence of poverty, inequalities and power imbalances between the owners of tourism enterprises and their workers. These power imbalances manifest also between the tourist (upper hand/at an advantage) and the hosts (on the back foot/at a disadvantage).

Tourism investment is important to keep the tourism sector growing. As such, FDI is an important factor in developing economies where domestic investment may be deficient (Snyman & Saayman, 2009, p. 49). In general, incentives to attract investments are also important, but at times they are not always positive. Countries that have a small tourism sector may use tax exemptions to lure foreign investment but it also represents a form of income loss (Wiranatha et al., 2017, p. 3). While governments – for example, OECD governments – usually support incentives, these incentives “sometimes actively reinforce inequalities” (Oman, 2000 in United Nations Industrial Development Organisation – UNIDO, 2009, p. 111). For example, high levels of FDI that attempt to support economic growth and environmental progress can increase income inequality (Ridzuan et al., 2017, p. 17). Investment incentives have tended to benefit foreign investors at the expense of local economies. For instance, in Jamaica, foreign investors in the tourism and other sectors enjoy duty exemption on imports for the construction of properties, and they enjoy huge tax breaks for up to 15 years and expedited licences (Sinclair-Maragh & Gursoy, 2015, p. 153). While tourism represents a valuable option for the development of emerging economies, in some circumstances, the envisaged socio-economic development does not happen as the benefits go to foreign firms or local elites and when development happens, it does so at a high cost to the environment as well as to the social sphere (Telfer & Sharpley, 2008, p. 345). In the socio-economic sphere, the colonial situation of the master-servant is recreated as the tourist plays the role of the master because of his/her inflated currency to buy services provided by the host/servant, for a song – albeit in a free and democratic “post-colonial” society.

Community-based tourism

The CBT approach is gaining traction in many countries given its ability to improve local economies (Lee & Jan, 2019, p. 368). Community-based tourism is an alternative tourism development approach and its origin is linked to grass-

roots alternative approaches that emerged in the 1970s to counter mass tourism to promote processes that allow benefits from tourism to flow to local communities and alleviate poverty through their active participation (Jamal et al., 2019, p. 125). While the “CBT” term is vague and elusive, literature shows various commonalities such as local ownership of projects, meaningful participation, decision-making, benefit-sharing between members and fulfilling host-guest interactions (Schott & Nhem, 2018, p. 357). One of the foci of CBT is community participation from project initiation, to planning, execution, management, monitoring, and evaluation, as well as benefit sharing (Schott & Nhem, 2018, p. 357). Specifically attached to alternative development issues CBT supports social justice, empowerment, redistribution, sustainability and ownership and control of projects (Saayman & Giampiccoli, 2016, p. 153). Community-based tourism is specifically intended to be for the marginalised and disadvantaged people in society (Tasci et al., 2013, p. 10). It warrants to be an attraction for disadvantaged groups because it is based on grassroots assets, capabilities and abilities at the individual and community levels. It is based on what one has and what can be galvanised for social action and change at the community level to address unemployment and poverty.

Two main principles or characteristics of CBT are here relevant, namely: the active involvement of local people (meaning prioritizing marginalised and disadvantaged people in society) ownership/control and management of CBT by local people; and the redistributive intents of CBT for empowerment and inclusion. Community-based tourism is about all-inclusive community participation, equity, and the sharing of benefits and costs (Tasci et al., 2013, p. 22). Therefore, local control and ownership are fundamental issues. Literature also shows that local ownership and control of CBT are fundamental features in CBT (Höckert, 2009, p. 20; Tamir, 2015, p. 70; Giampiccoli & Saayman, 2018a, p. 760; Jamal et al., 2019, p. 126). Local control and ownership are important tenets for the sustainability and long-term functionality of projects (Tamir, 2015, p. 70). In this context, CBT should descend to a mere neo-colonial tourism approach where businesses are foreign-owned and controlled and often bestow very few benefits to local people (Ullan de La Rosa et al., 2017, p. 469). As such, CBT must benefit the local community instead of external entities (Kaur et al., 2016, p. 7). CBT should be based on collective ownership and management, and social, cultural and ecological preservation (Ullan de La Rosa et al., 2017, p. 469). Amongst other issues, CBT also allows territorial appropriation by the community (Guijarro et al., 2018, p. 13).

Beyond local ownership and control, CBT also implies redistribution and equity. A main principle of CBT is equity in the distribution of wealth and income to create winners (Tasci et al., 2013, p. 12). The concept of CBT identifies with ethical relationships grounded in communities (Dangi & Jamal, 2008, p. 12; Gi-

ampiccoli & Saayman, 2018b, p. 22). In this context, the CBT approach implies having direct and indirect beneficiaries linked to CBT (Sproule & Suhandi, 1998, p. 216; Suansri, 2003, p. 69; Ndlovu & Rogerson, 2004, p. 446; Singh, 2008, p. 156). Community-based tourism's collective approach is not to deny or discourage individual entrepreneurship, but it positions the community at the centre of tourism and community development. Thus, for local communities to develop, CBT requires shifts in economic, political and social power in their favour, to ensure that CBT is implemented through public policy accompanied by meaningful community involvement (Yanes et al., 2019, p. 3). Altogether, it can be observed that CBT has the following common principles: local ownership, local control of the local commons (natural and cultural) and local economic and social benefits, gender equity, empowerment, enhancing social capital and upholding community agency (Jamal et al., 2019, p. 126). Together with community participation, organizational forms and institutional structures are imperative for local ownership and stewardship, and fair distribution of benefits and costs of tourism development (Jamal et al., 2019, p. 126). For CBT to impact positively on livelihoods, the benefits must accrue to community members.

Community-based tourism has been also linked to corporate social responsibility (CSR) in various companies, governments and organisations with the justification that they have a role to play in offering innovative social responsibility assistance to needy communities as they execute their social responsibilities, and contracts (Ching Tan & Sitikarn, 2019, p. 901). However, CBT should not remain a small tourism niche if its role is to change the tourism sector for the benefit of many disadvantaged people in society. Community-based tourism practices benefit and prioritise disadvantaged community members in a context of redistributive social justice, at equally the local and global levels, to ensure the localisation of ownership and control of the sector in totality (Saayman & Giampiccoli, 2016, p. 166). The need to globalise CBT is premised on starting a process to shift the current conventional/mass tourism sector, towards the adoption of CBT principles and characteristics that make the tourism sector a vehicle in the fight against inequality and poverty around the world. The article does not prescribe that conventional tourism businesses should convert 100% to CBT businesses (while desired, this is a medium/long-term strategy that can take place in stages). The article proposes an incentive framework that supports this transformation.

Concurrently, to be able to foster and expand CBT, there is the need to make sure there is uniformity of thinking and understanding about what CBT is; its principles, approaches and characteristics. It is here proposed that it is not possible to advance CBT without properly standardising it and associating it with specific indicators or indexes. In this context, literature (see, for example, Choi &

Sirakaya, 2006; Cambodia Community-based Ecotourism Network, 2009; Park & Yoon, 2011; Mearns, 2015; ASEAN, 2016; Bulatović & Rajović, 2016; Giampiccoli & Mtapuri, 2016, 2017) has already proposed indicators, indexes, standards and grading proposals for CBT. Indicators can serve to measure changes in the tourism development and management process and indicators “can measure: a) changes in tourism’s structures and internal factors, b) changes in external factors which affect tourism and c) the impacts caused by tourism” (Bulatović & Rajović, 2016, p. 324; Mearns, 2015, p. 180). As noted, using indicators properly makes them plausible management tools or performance measures from which to derive vital information useful for management decision-making and for stakeholders in the sector (Mearns, 2015, p. 180; Bulatović & Rajović, 2016, p. 310). Amongst other issues, there are indicators related to community decision-making structures and some related to community benefits from tourism. Mearns (2015) uses six types of CBT ventures based on ownership and management structures, these are operations owned and managed by entrepreneurs from communities, operations wholly owned and managed by communities, operations run through informal agreements between private sector operators and communities, operations run through formal agreements between the private sector operators and communities, operational partnerships between state, private sector operators and communities, operations run by organizations such as national trusts or societies. In another study on sustainability indicators for CBT (Choi & Sirakaya, 2006) several key economic themes (thereafter subdivided into various indicators) within the economic dimension are presented such as employment, income distribution/capital, leakage and linkage, capital formation in the community/investment, economic well-being, labor/company and job conditions, and local government income. Giampiccoli and Mtapuri (2016, p. 183) have proposed the community-based tourism affinity index (CBTAI) to specifically assist in categorising and classifying CBT ventures based on CBT principles and characteristics. The CBTAI proposes specific items related to ownership and management of the CBT venture ranging from full community ownership to private ownership of the CBT ventures – this last being considered less valuable about CBT principles and characteristics (Giampiccoli & Mtapuri, 2016). The CBTI is geared towards assisting in the establishment of a CBT grading system to grade the various CBT ventures (Giampiccoli & Mtapuri, 2016).

Community-based tourism standards have also been advanced. For instance, the CBT standards proposed by the Cambodia Community-based Ecotourism Network (2009, p. 3, 4) ask the questions about the CBT venture:

– Is it managed by a committee democratically elected by community members every 2–5 year?

- Has management that builds the capacity of the community?
- Has a management structure that includes clearly defined roles and responsibilities?
- Has a community development fund that is used for initiatives benefiting the entire community?
- Has clear and agreed benefit sharing guidelines?
- Has a policy for equal opportunities in income generating activities?

The same document (Cambodia Community-based Ecotourism Network, 2009, p. 4) shows how CBT should be linked to the local context. A CBT venture is interrogated, thus:

- a commitment to employ local community members,
- a commitment to local/regional sourcing of products and services,
- encouraging the local community to substitute imported products for local ones,
- supports new initiatives to create alternative livelihoods,
- cooperates with others to increase tourism in the region.

The ASEAN (2016, p. 3) document also presents similar standards and it mentions “[t]he ASEAN CBT Standard provides umbrella performance indicators for the coordinated management of tourism products offered by communities under the organisation of a CBT Committee.” ASEAN (2016) indicators include issues related to community ownership and management and contribution to social well-being.

Another research by Giampiccoli and Mtapuri, (2017) proposes a CBT classification system based on an E’s model, which includes Endogenous, Environment, Education, Empowerment, Equity, Evolving, Enduring, Entrepreneurship, Ethical and Externalities as some of the principles. In this E’s model, the classification context says:

specific enterprises could be developed based on E’s model to attract specific market segments of tourists who are predisposed to pay attention to the impacts of tourism on the various local contexts. In this regard, while companies could comply with the various elements of the new rating system, it is proposed that new companies could also be established based on it. (Giampiccoli & Mtapuri, 2017, p. 9)

Thus, “[t]he hotel (or other tourism business) which adheres to the innovative E’s model could be denominated as an E-Hotel (or E-Travel agency and so on) and be awarded a specific number of E’s or stars” (Giampiccoli & Mtapuri, 2017, p. 9). This article follows this last issue and goes beyond it by proposing a link between the transformation of conventional tourism business to an “E-tourism business” and incentives. It is recognized that businesses are more inclined to transform towards CBT principles if they receive incentives to do so.

Community-based tourism incentivisation model

The quest for improving living standards of marginalised groups

There is a need to excogitate and advance new solutions to transform the conventional/mass tourism sector into being a protagonist in the fight against inequality and poverty. As a major global sector, tourism should not escape its role in fighting against inequality and poverty. The UNWTO (2018, p. 16) argues that tourism can enhance local economic development and generate social opportunities, necessitating the need to advance more inclusive tourism development approaches. The World Economic Forum (WEF) notes the slow progress in living standards and the widening inequality in both developed and developing countries and calls for more inclusive development (WEF, 2018, p. 1). In that light, the UN Under-Secretary-General for Economic and Social Affairs suggests that to alleviate poverty, growth without inclusion is not sufficient (Hongbo, 2013, p. 7). Community-based tourism can be related towards inclusive tourism. Thus, inclusive tourism is defined as “[t]ransformative tourism in which marginalized groups are engaged in ethical production or consumption of tourism and the sharing of its benefits” (Scheyvens & Biddulph, 2018, p. 592). Similar to CBT, in inclusive tourism, the protagonists are the poor and/or marginalized groups or any other groups that lack “power and/or voice” (Scheyvens & Biddulph, 2018, p. 592). The inclusion is about the disadvantaged and marginalized playing a role in tourism to improve their standards of living.

Giampiccoli and Saayman (2017, p. 10) observe that in CBT the greater burden appears to be placed on disadvantaged people as they “are intrinsically supposed to be environmentally friendly, while for conventional tourism this remains a voluntary option, not a defining requirement.” This is a huge contradiction.

Conventional/mass tourism and the tourism industry, in general, should consider the same issues implicitly in the industry and its CSR marketing image. In other words, the industry should make issues such as environmental, social and cultural conservation, and any other positive impacts implicit in all tourism sectors, thus, inserting CBT principles in the general conventional/mass tourism sector.

The role of incentives

This paper supports a move by conventional tourism to adopt CBT principles and characteristics. For that to happen, a system of incentives associated with specific CBT indicators is imperative. The recently proposed Investment Redistributive Incentive Model (IRIM) also follows similar lines using incentives as a way to transform the tourism (or other) sectors; where “IRIM is to use, exploit investment

for redistribution” (Giampiccoli & Mtapuri, 2020, p. 11). Incentives can be used to encourage through suasion tourism businesses to adopt CBT principles and characteristics. While various indicators can be linked to an array of incentives, this article advances three key fundamental indicators, namely: ownership, management structure and the redistribution of economic benefits. Based on company size and sector, different incentives could be offered for both new investments and already established tourism businesses where there is a willingness to change.

This article uses a simplified example based on ownership and tax reduction incentives (but various other types of incentives should be excogitated and applied) for an established privately-owned hotel (this example draws inputs from Giampiccoli & Mtapuri, 2016, 2017). Procedurally, it is a matter of linking specific CBT indicators to a classification system and in turn, this is juxtaposed to specific incentives for the tourism company.

The initial condition is a Hotel owned by a private company without any ownership relationship with the community – as most hotels are currently managed/ owned. Table 1 represents the initial stage.

Table 1. Initial – “usual” – stage of ownership

Hotel: nature of ownership	Ownership	Sub-items
External ownership	Private company	Private Business

Source: Authors’ own study.

From stage 1, the venture can take various pathways to include – or go towards – various CBT ownership principles in the hotel ownership structure. In this case, the aim should be to include staff (prioritizing the lower level staff) and, as much as possible, the local surrounding community (prioritizing disadvantaged groups/individuals) in the ownership structure of the hotel. The main approaches can include, one approach or a combination:

- giving to individual staff members a share in the business,
- giving to staff members as a collective entity, such as trust or cooperative, a share in the business,
- giving individual local community members a share in the business,
- giving local community members as a collective entity, such as trust or cooperative, a share in the business,

Opening up the possibilities

These above approaches are the only four; possibly, fundamental strategic pathways by which a hotel could advance CBT-related ownership principles. The

highest level of adherence/compliance towards the CBT ownership principle will be to give ownership shares through established collective entities, to both staff and local community members, while the lesser CBT adherence/compliance pathway will probably be to exclusively give individual shares to hotel staff. Thus, establishing various possible ownership structures, based on the inclusion of hotel staff and local community members, different incentives could be applied based on their “closeness” to CBT principles. This example is general and does not consider possible variables such as the number of employees and the specific tourism or accommodation sector. The present example assumes that the company gives 10% of its ownership share towards redistribution (that is to staff and/or community members). This example only considers tax reduction as an incentive but other forms of incentives should be excogitated and implemented, such as, for example, a fast-tracked registration in the bureaucracy (see also Giampiccoli & Mtapuri, 2020). The tax incentives can take various forms such as tax reliefs, credits, exemptions, rebates and any other forms of incentives. Table 2 shows an example of tax incentives.

Table 2. Example of possible ownership categories with associated tax reduction incentive

Category	Involving	Type of share	Incentives (tax reduction)
1	Hotel staff Local community	Collective entity or entities	20%
2	Hotel staff Local community	Collective entity/ies Individual community members	10%
3	Hotel staff Local community	Individual hotel members Collective entity/ies	10%
4	Hotel staff Local community	Individual members	5%
5	Hotel staff	Collective entity/ies	8%
6	Local community	Collective entity/ies	8%
7	Hotel staff	Individual hotel members	3%
8	Local community	Individual community members	3%

Source: Authors' own study.

Thus, if the hotel gives “away” 10% ownership to hotel staff and/or local community members it will have a commensurate tax reduction (see Table 2). Considering category 1 as an example (see Table 2), it can be proposed that the company will see a tax reduction of 20%. As in IRIM (see Giampiccoli & Mtapuri, 2020, p. 9), “incentives to the company need to be calculated as a »net« value without the shareholding (or profit or other strategies) shared for redistributive purposes”. The monetary advance to be given is for both the hotel tax reduction and hotel staff and/or community members for extra income. Even if they pay tax on it, they still have extra income at their disposal. At the same time, the government’s losses are minimal as the share of profit to staff and/or community is still taxable in their hands.

These strategies will allow more people to participate in the mainstream economy as shareholders, empowered workers and empowered community members.

Various combinations of incentives based on the combinations of CBT principles and characteristics and on the level of redistribution, such as the percentage of shares for staff and community, can be defined. The adherence to CBT principles and characteristics could be part of a new classification system (also see, for example, Giampiccoli & Mtapuri, 2017). Besides being advantageous to the hotel, this classification system could be useful to both the hotel and any other tourism business, to market itself to attract tourists. There is a compelling need to also link these incentives to poverty alleviation and inequality reduction.

CONCLUSIONS

The tourism industry has seen the owners of capital as the bastions of profit. This paper covered efforts by the government and other players to find ways to incentivize CBT ventures to create wealth to reduce poverty within nations. The framework for incentives to encourage embracing CBT principles, along with incentives for either profit sharing and/or capital sharing are based on socio-economic principles that include assessing the current owners of capital, staff and surrounding communities and local governments. The restructuring of tourism ventures in terms of ownership creates a win-win situation in the bargaining process for all stakeholders. For instance, including the community, augurs well for a greener environmental management process for the tourism industry, as the community has a direct and vested interest and voice both in the organization and the space in which they live – boding well, for example, for improved environmental impact assessment reports.

The authors submit that this is just one proposal that could address the issues associated with current practices and ownership within the tourism industry and create a more viable and sustainable tourism industry. Further research is required and government buy-in is critical, to legislatively bring about the required changes, in particular, tax reliefs, credits, exemptions, rebates (and other forms of incentives). The theoretical contribution of the paper is around the incentives that are possible and the practicality of achieving individual community empowerment for enhancing the standard of living of communities. Yet, the status quo requires a change within the tourism industry to initiate a comprehensive approach to profit sharing within the industry, to facilitate the alleviation of poverty, the transfer of necessary skills and the social elevation of the staff and community in which tourism is prevalent.

REFERENCES

- Alvaredo, F., Chancel, L., Piketty, T., Saez, E., & Zucman, G. (Eds.). (2018). *World Inequality Report 2018*. Belknap Press of Harvard University Press. <https://wir2018.wid.world/files/download/wir2018-full-report-english.pdf>
- Archer, B., Cooper, C., & Ruhanen, L. (2005). The positive and negative impacts of tourism. In W.F. Theobald (Ed.), *Global Tourism* (pp. 79–102). Elsevier.
- ASEAN. (2016). *ASEAN Community Based Tourism Standard*. ASEAN Secretariat. <https://www.asean.org/wp-content/uploads/2012/05/ASEAN-Community-Based-Tourism-Standard.pdf>
- Bianchi, R. (2018). The political economy of tourism development: A critical review. *Annals of Tourism Research*, 70, 88–102. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.annals.2017.08.005>
- Bulatović, J., & Rajović, G. (2016). Applying sustainable tourism indicators to community-based ecotourism tourist village Eco-katun Štavna. *European Journal of Economic Studies*, 16(2), 309–330. <https://doi.org/10.13187/es.2016.16.309>
- Burren & Cliffs of Moher Geopark. (2017). *Good Practice Guide. The role of tourism enterprises*. http://www.burrengeopark.ie/wp-content/uploads/2017/11/Good_Practice_Guide_The_role_of_tourism_enterprises.pdf
- Cambodia Community-based Ecotourism Network. (2009). *Community-based tourism standards in Cambodia*. https://ysrinfo.files.wordpress.com/2012/06/7_cbt-standards-in-cambodia.pdf
- Ching Tan, C., & Sitikarn, B. (2019). Balanced scorecard (BSC) structured business model for tribes-based community-based tourism: Cases with Chiang Rai. *Journal of MCU Peace Studies*, 7(4), 899–922. <https://so03.tci-thaijo.org/index.php/journal-peace/article/view/202694>
- Choi, H.C., & Sirakaya, E. (2006). Sustainability indicators for managing community tourism. *Tourism Management*, 27, 1274–1289. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tourman.2005.05.018>
- Chok, S., Macbeth, J., & Warren, C. (2007). Tourism as a tool for poverty alleviation: A critical analysis of ‘pro-poor tourism’ and implications for sustainability. *Current Issues in Tourism*, 10(2/3), 144–165. <https://doi.org/10.2167/cit303>
- Dangi, T.B., & Jamal, T. (2008). An integrated approach to “sustainable community-based tourism”. *Sustainability*, 8(475), 1–32. <https://doi.org/10.3390/su8050475>
- Dervis, K., & Qureshi, Z. (2016). *Income distribution within countries: rising inequality*. *Global Economy and Development at Brookings*. https://www.brookings.edu/wp-content/uploads/2016/08/income-inequality-within-countries_august-2016-003.pdf
- Dwyer, L., Edwards, D., Mistilis, N., Roman, C., & Scott, N. (2009). Destination and enterprise management for a tourism future. *Tourism Management*, 30, 63–74. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tourman.2008.04.002>
- Faulkenberry, L.V., Coggeshall, J.M., Backman, K., & Backman, S. (2000). A culture of servitude. The impact of tourism and development on South Carolina’s Coast. *Human Organization*, 59(1), 86–95. <https://doi.org/10.17730/humo.59.1.353730461t724j02>
- Gartner, C., & Cukier, J. (2012). Is tourism employment a sufficient mechanism for poverty reduction? A case study from Nkhata Bay, Malawi. *Current Issues in Tourism*, 15(6), 545–562. <https://doi.org/10.1080/13683500.2011.629719>
- Giampiccoli, A., & Mtapuri, O. (2016). A community-based tourism affinity index: Its development and possible use. *African Journal of Hospitality, Tourism and Leisure*, 5(1), article 3, 1–16. http://www.ajhtl.com/uploads/7/1/6/3/7163688/article_3_vol_5_1_2016.pdf
- Giampiccoli, A., & Mtapuri, O. (2017). Beyond community-based tourism: Towards a new tourism classification system. *Gazeta de Antropologia*, 33(1), 15–32. <https://doi.org/10.30827/Digibug.44467>
- Giampiccoli, A., & Mtapuri, O. (2020). Introducing the investment redistributive incentive model (IRIM): A new redistribution perspective in tourism investment and beyond. *African*

- Journal of Hospitality, Tourism and Leisure*, 9(1), article 58, 1–16. <https://www.ajhtl.com/uploads/7/1/6/3/7163688/article>
- Giampiccoli, A., & Saayman, M. (2017). Community-based tourism, responsible tourism, and infrastructure development and poverty. *African Journal of Hospitality, Tourism and Leisure*, 6(2), article 19, 1–28. http://www.ajhtl.com/uploads/7/1/6/3/7163688/article_19_vol_6_2_2017.pdf
- Giampiccoli, A., & Saayman, M. (2018a). South African community-based tourism operational guidelines: Analysis and critical review. *African Journal of Science, Technology, Innovation and Development*, 10(6), 759–770. <https://doi.org/10.1080/20421338.2018.1463653>
- Giampiccoli, A., & Saayman, M. (2018b). Community-based tourism development model and community participation. *African Journal of Hospitality, Tourism and Leisure*, 7(4), article 16, 1–27. <https://www.ajhtl.com/uploads/7/1/6/3/7163688/article>
- Guevara Manzo, G. (2019). Economic impacts 2019. In *WTTC, Travel & Tourism Economic Impact 2019 World*. World Travel & Tourism Council.
- Guijarro, G., Pacheco, V., & Verdesoto, J.F. (2018). Percepciones y sostenibilidad del turismo comunitario: comunidad Shiripuno. Misahuallí – Ecuador. *Antropología Cuadernos de Investigación*, 19, 12–34. <https://doi.org/10.26807/ant.v0i19.146>
- Höckert, E. (2009). *Sociocultural Sustainability of Rural Community-Based Tourism. Case Study of Local Participation in Fair Trade Coffee Trail, Nicaragua*. Lapland University Press.
- Holden, A., Sonne, J., & Novelli, M. (2011). Tourism and poverty reduction: An interpretation by the Poor of Elmina, Ghana. *Tourism Planning & Development*, 8(3), 317–334. <https://doi.org/10.1080/21568316.2011.591160>
- Hongbo, W. (2013). Preface. In United Nations (Ed.), *Inequality Matters* (pp. 7–8). Report of the World Social Situation 2013. Document ST/ESA/345. United Nations, Department of Economic and Social Affairs.
- Jamal, T., Budke, C., & Barradas-Briebesca, I. (2019). Community-based tourism and development. In R. Sharpley & D. Harrison (Eds.), *A Research Agenda for Tourism and Development* (pp. 125–150). Edward Elgar Publishing Limited.
- Kaur, P., Jawaid, A., & Bt Abu Othman, N. (2016). The impact of community based tourism on community development in Sarawak. *Journal of Borneo Kalimantan*, 2(1), 15–26. http://www.borneo.unimas.my/images/jbk2016/2_community-tourism_Parveen_ArifNorizan.pdf
- Khemili, H., & Belloumi, M. (2018). Cointegration relationship between growth, inequality and poverty in Tunisia. *International Journal of Applied Economics, Finance and Accounting*, 2(1), 8–18.
- Kinyondo, A., & Pelizzo, R. (2015). Tourism, development and inequality: The case of Tanzania. *Poverty & Public Policy*, 7(1), 64–79. <https://doi.org/10.1002/pop4.92>
- Kinyondo, A., & Pelizzo, R. (2018). *Growth, employment, poverty and inequality in Tanzania*. AGDI Working Paper, No. WP/18/001, African Governance and Development Institute (AGDI), Yaoundé. <https://www.econstor.eu/bitstream/10419/191324/1/agdi-wp-18-001.pdf>
- Lee, T.H. & Jan, F-H. (2019). Can community-based tourism contribute to sustainable development? Evidence from residents' perceptions of the sustainability. *Tourism Management*, 70, 368–380. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tourman.2018.09.003>
- Lew, A.A. (2011). Tourism's role in the global economy. *Tourism Geographies*, 13(1), 148–151. <https://doi.org/10.1080/14616688.2010.531046>
- Llorca-Rodríguez, C.M., Casas-Jurado, A.C., & García-Fernández, R.M. (2016). Tourism and poverty alleviation: An empirical analysis using panel data on Peru's departments. *International Journal of Tourism Research*, 19, 746–756. <https://doi.org/10.1002/jtr.2147>
- Ma, B., Cai, Z., Zheng, J., & Wen, Y. (2019). Conservation, ecotourism, poverty, and income inequality – a case study of nature reserves in Qinling, China. *World Development*, 115, 236–244. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.worlddev.2018.11.017>

- Mathew, P.V., & Sreejesh S. (2017). Impact of responsible tourism on destination sustainability and quality of life of community in tourism destinations. *Journal of Hospitality and Tourism Management*, 31, 83–89. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jhtm.2016.10.001>
- Mearns, K. (2015). Applying sustainable tourism indicators to community-based ecotourism ventures in Southern Africa. *Athens Journal of Tourism*, 2(3), 179–194. <https://doi.org/10.30958/ajt.2-3-4>
- Nagarjuna, G. (2015). Local community involvement in tourism: A content analysis of websites of wildlife resorts. *Atna, Journal of Tourism Studies*, 10(1), pp. 13–21. <https://doi.org/10.12727/ajts.13.2>
- Ndlovu, N., & Rogerson, C.M. (2004). The local economic impacts of rural community-based tourism in Eastern Cape. In C.M. Rogerson & G. Visser (Eds.), *Tourism and development issues in contemporary South Africa* (pp. 436–451). Africa Institute of South Africa.
- Niemhom, N. (2018). Executive summary. In *UNWTO, Inclusive Tourism Destinations Model and success stories* (pp. 9–11). World Tourism Organisation.
- Oviedo-García, M.A., González-Rodríguez, M.R., & Vega-Vázquez, M.V. (2019). Does Sun-and-sea all-inclusive tourism contribute to poverty alleviation and/or income inequality reduction? The case of the Dominican Republic. *Journal of Travel Research*, 58(6), 995–1013.
- Park, D-B., & Yoon, Y-C. (2011). Developing sustainable rural tourism evaluation indicators. *International Journal of Tourism Research*, 13, 401–415. <https://doi.org/10.1177%2F0047287518789272>
- Pikkemaat, B. (2008). *Innovation in small and medium sized tourism enterprises: A review of the literature and an agenda for research*. Paper presented at the TTRA European Conference, “Competition in Tourism: Business and Destination Perspectives”, April 23–25, 2008 Helsinki, Finland.
- Ridzuan, A.R., Ismail, N.A., & Che Hamat, A.F. (2017). Does foreign direct investment successfully lead to sustainable development in Singapore? *Economies*, 5(29), 1–20. <https://doi.org/10.3390/economies5030029>
- Rohwerder, B. (2016). *Poverty and Inequality: Topic Guide*. GSDRC, University of Birmingham.
- Saayman, M., & Giampiccoli, A. (2016). Community-based and pro-poor tourism: Initial assessment of their relation to community development. *European Journal of Tourism Research*, 12, 145–190. <https://ejtr.vumk.eu/index.php/about/article/view/418>
- Saayman, M., Rossouw, R., & Krugell, W. (2012). The impact of tourism on poverty in South Africa. *Development Southern Africa*, 29(3), 462–487. <https://doi.org/10.1080/0376835X.2012.706041>
- Sauce, B., & Matzel, L.D. (n.d.). *Inductive reasoning*.
- Scheyvens, R., & Biddulph, R. (2018). Inclusive tourism development. *Tourism Geographies*, 20(4), 589–609. <https://doi.org/10.1080/14616688.2017.1381985>
- Schott, C., & Nhem, S. (2018). Paths to the market: Analysing tourism distribution channels for community-based tourism. *Tourism Recreation Research*, 43(3), 356–371. <https://doi.org/10.1080/02508281.2018.1447837>
- Sinclair-Maragh, G., & Gursoy, D. (2015). Imperialism and tourism: The case of developing island countries. *Annals of Tourism Research*, 50, 143–158. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.annals.2014.12.001>
- Singh, L.K. (2008). *Ecology, Environment and Tourism*. ESHA Books.
- Snyman, J.A., & Saayman, M. (2009). Key factors influencing foreign direct investment in the tourism industry in South Africa. *Tourism Review*, 64(3), 49–58. <https://doi.org/10.1108/16605370910988827>
- Sproule, K.W., & Suhandri, A.S. (1998). Guidelines for community-based ecotourism programs: Lessons from Indonesia. In K. Lindberg, M. Epler Wood & D. Engeldrum (Eds.), *Ecotourism: A Guide for Planners and Managers* (Vol. 2, pp. 215–235). The Ecotourism Society.
- Stoddard, J.E., Pollard, C.E., & Evans, M.R. (2012). The triple bottom line: A framework for sustainable tourism development. *International Journal of Hospitality & Tourism Administration*, 13(3), 233–258. <https://doi.org/10.1080/15256480.2012.698173>

- Suansri, P. (2003). *Community Based Tourism Handbook*. Responsible Ecological Social Tour-REST.
- Tabosa, F.J.S., Castelar De Carvalho, P.U., & Irffi, G. (2016). *Brazil, 1981–2013: the effects of economic growth and income inequality on poverty*. Revista CEPAL, Naciones Unidas Comisión Económica para América Latina y el Caribe (CEPAL).
- Tamir, M. (2015). Challenges and opportunities of community based tourism development in Aw zone: A case study in Guagusa and Banja Woredas, Ethiopia. *Journal of Tourism, Hospitality and Sports*, 11, 50–78. <https://www.iiste.org/Journals/index.php/JTHS/article/view/24694>
- Tasci, A.D.S., Semrad, K.J., & Yilmaz, S.S. (2013). *Community based tourism finding the equilibrium in COMCEC context: Setting the Pathway for the Future*. COMCEC Coordination Office.
- Telfer, D.J., & Sharpley, R. (2008). *Tourism and Development in the Developing World*. Routledge.
- Tosun, C., Timothy, D.J., & Öztürk, Y. (2003). Tourism growth, national development and regional inequality in Turkey. *Journal of Sustainable Tourism*, 11(2–3), 133–161. <https://doi.org/10.1080/09669580308667200>
- Triarchi, E.I., & Karamanis, K. (2017). The evolution of alternative forms of Tourism: a theoretical background. *Business & Entrepreneurship Journal*, 6(1), 39–59. http://www.scienpress.com/Upload/BEJ%2fVol%206_1_4.pdf
- Ullan de La Rosa, F.J., Aledo Tur, A., & Garcia Andreu, H. (2017). Community-based tourism and the political instrumentalization of the concept of community. A new theoretical approach and an ethnographical case study in Northeastern Brazil. *Anthropos*, 112, 467–486. <https://doi.org/10.5771/0257-9774-2017-2-467>
- UN. (2013). *Inequality Matters. Report of the World Social Situation 2013*. Document ST/ESA/345. United Nations, Department of Economic and Social Affairs.
- UN. (2019). *World Economic Situation and Prospects 2019*. United Nations.
- UNIDO. (2009). *Multinational Enterprises' Foreign Direct Investment Location Decisions within the Global Factory*. Research and Statistics Branch Working Paper 04/2009. UNIDO.
- UNWTO. (2018). *Inclusive Tourism Destinations Model and success stories*. World Tourism Organisation.
- WEF. (2018). *The Inclusive Development Index 2018 Summary and Data Highlights*. http://www3.weforum.org/docs/WEF_Forum_IncGrwth_2018.pdf Accessed 10th March 2020
- Wenjing Lv. (2018). A new model of tourism enterprise management under the concept of eco-tourism management. *Advances in Social Science, Education and Humanities Research*, 132, 243–246.
- Wiranatha, A.S., Antara, M., & Suryawardani, I.G.A.O. (2017). Impact of tourism leakage on the growth of economic sectors, employment and income distribution in Bali, Indonesia. *International Journal of Economic Research*, 14(8), 11–27.
- WTTC. (2019). *Travel & Tourism Economic Impact 2019 World*. World Travel & Tourism Council.
- Yanes, A., Zielinski, S., Diaz Cano, M., & Kim, S.I. (2019). Community-based tourism in developing countries: A framework for policy evaluation. *Sustainability*, 11(2506), 1–23. <https://doi.org/10.3390/su11092506>
- Yang, L. (2018). *The relationship between poverty and inequality: Resource constraint mechanisms*. CASEpaper211/LIPpaper5. Centre for Analysis of Social Exclusion, London School of Economics.

PUBLICATION INFO		
SUBMITTED: 2024.01.02	ACCEPTED: 2024.09.26	PUBLISHED ONLINE: 2024.11.04